UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION AGENCY PUBLIC MEETING
----------x
IN RE: JEWETT WHITE LEAD REMOVAL SITE
----------x

Meeting held in the above-entitled matter at CATHOLIC YOUTH ORGANIZATION, 120 Anderson Avenue, Staten Island, New York, on March 16, 2011, at 7:10 p.m., before Christine Cutrone, a Notary Public for and within the State of New York.

A P P E A R A N C E S :

WANDA AYALA, EPA

ERIC WILSON, EPA

KIM STAIGER, EPA

JOHN SENN, EPA Public Affairs

MICHAEL SOFRONAS, Interpreter

JULIE MCPHERSON, Risk Assessor

MARK MADDALOVI, Toxicologist

TERRY WESLEY, Env. Justice Coordinator

HENRY GUZMAN, Attorney EPA

TASHA FRAZIER, Env. Justice Office EPA

PROCEEDING

MS. AYALA: Good evening. Thank you for being here with us tonight. My name is Wanda Ayala. I'm the community involvement coordinator from EPA assigned to the Jewett White Lead Removal Site. We're here this evening to present to you our Superfund performance response action for the Jewett White Lead Removal Site.

I'm not going to give a presentation. My colleagues are. But I just want to ask if you have cell phones, if could you put them on vibrate please. We have an interpreter here tonight for anyone that needs help with the materials to be explained to them from English to Spanish. We also have a stenographer. Because as this meeting is for you to provide comments to us to go on the record, we're required to have a stenographer. Her name is

PROCEEDING

Christine.

After the presentation, we ask that you keep your questions and comments until after the presentation just to make it easier for Christine. And every time you speak you need to tell her your name and spell your last name, if possible.

With that I'm going to hand the program over to Eric Wilson.

MR. WILSON: Thanks Wanda.

My name is Eric Wilson. I'm a manager in the Superfund program. I'm going to just give you a quick overview and talk to you why we are here.

We're here tonight to hear from you. Since we were last here in the community, we have done some additional investigations at the Jewett White Lead Site. We used that data to develop and evaluate several alternatives for the cleanup

of the site. And this is the process of which Wanda mentioned the engineering, evaluation and cost analysis.

We've come up with what we think is the best way to handle that. That's what we are calling our preferred alternative. But, again, we want to hear from the community, from you, before we make our selection on how to cleanup this site.

So, now, I'm going to turn it over -- before I turn it over to Kim Staiger, I'm going to do some introductions. Kim Staiger is our on team coordinator for the site. She is the equivalent of our project manager. She'll be handling the cleanup of the site. We have Julie McPherson. Julie is our risk assessor for the site. Mark Maddalovi who is a toxicologist with EPA. You already met Wanda Ayala.

PROCEEDING

We have Ian Beilby from the State of New York Department of Environmental Conservation. Terry Wesley our environmental Justice Coordinator. Tasha Frazier also with Environmental Justice office. Henry Guzman our attorney for the site. John Senn. John is with our Public Affairs Division. He is our press contact. And that is everyone from EPA.

So, now I'm going to turn it over to Kim. She has a presentation for you. And then after she completes her presentation, we'll take public comments. And thank you again for coming.

MS. STAIGER: So before I go into the engineering evaluation of cost analysis that was developed for the Jewett White Lead Site, I'm going to give a very brief site history for those who are unfamiliar with the site or haven't attended

PROCEEDING

the public meetings that we had in the past on the site.

So in 1839 John Jewett and sons began operating a white led manufacturing plant at 2015 Richmond Terrace. What they would do is they would corrode these led buckles over clay pots and jars of vinegar which they would then apply heat source to and it would form this corroded led that was then scraped off the led buckles and use that as a pigment in white led base paint.

In 1891 National Led then acquired the John Jewett and Son's company and they extended those operations to also include the 2000 Richmond Terrace property which is right across the street on Richmond Terrace. And the led manufacturing operations at both of these properties ceased sometime in early to mid 1940s. This is an old Sanborn Fire Insurance map from 1898

PROCEEDING

overlaid on a current aerial view of the properties. This right here is 2015 Richmond Terrace sits adjacent to the Kill Van Kull. And directly across the street here is the 2000 Richmond Terrace property. Where you could see there's a corroding house right here at 2000 Richmond Terrace. And a few corroding houses over here at 2015.

So how did the EPA become involved in the Jewett White Lead Site in Port Richmond? On June 3rd, 2008, EPA received a request from New York City Councilman Michael McMahon to come out to review a property at 2000, 2012 Richmond Terrace to determine whether or not a surplus removal action was required for the site. And in December of the same year, EPA, our contractors came out to the site to do some soil sampling to determine whether or not there were

PROCEEDING

contaminates at the property. What we found in the surface soils were very high led levels. Approximately 5,000 parts per million and concentrations increased with that.

In April 2009, the current property owner of the 2000 Richmond Terrace property Fafeta Realty Company (phonetic) had come out to the property and they took what we call an inner removal action. This is when they installed a wind screen or a protective screen around the fence. They also put in a silk fence to prevent any led containment soil from moving off the property. And they also seeded the property to maintain led contaminated soils on the property to make sure nothing is blown off the site into the neighboring community.

In June 2009, EPA then came back out to Port Richmond and we had done some offsite soil sampling in

the communities to determine whether or not the led contaminated soil had actually spread into the neighboring properties. And we also conducted surface soil samples at the 2015 Richmond Terrace property.

In October 2010, this past year, EPA then came back out to do additional sampling at both properties, 2000 and 2015 Richmond Terrace to complete our investigation. To determine the extent of the led impacts to do an engineering evaluation for EECA.

That brings us to today. So today the 2000 Richmond Terrace property which sits here on Kill Van Kull is currently homed to the Moran Towing Corporation which is an active tugboat facility. And you could see from here, it's mostly paved with a small unpaved area back here (indicating). So when we did our surface soil sampling, it was an

area where it looked liked there was deteriorating pigment or where soil tends to collect from the unpaved area in the back portion of the property.

2000 to 2012 Richmond Terrace here (indicating), is currently owned by the Fafeta Realty Company and it is a vacant undeveloped parcel of land that is not being used by the property owner today, but when EPA first became involved it was being used to store construction equipment and materials.

So what is this EECA that you keep seeing in the presentation and why do we need it for this property? EPA has characterized our removal actions or our cleanup program. We have three ways that we do removal actions separate from the remedial program. We have emergency removal action. This is when we have a

PROCEEDING

release or a threat of a release that needs to be addressed or stopped immediately. When we have to come out to the site right away to stop that release. We have time critical removal actions. This is when we have a release or a threat of a release and we have a little bit of time before we could take an onsite action, but we need to get out there pretty quickly. And then we have what is called an on time critical removal action. When EPA conducts an on time critical removal action, this is when we have six months or longer before an onsite action has to be started. And this also provides us the time to do a public process like we're doing today, where we invite public comments and we invite the public to review and evaluate the cleanup options that we are looking for at a site. This is done in the

engineering evaluation. Which must be completed for all our on time critical removal actions. So the EECA, the engineering evaluation cost analysis, this is a written document that we have a document for site history. The investigations done at both properties are removal alternatives and preferred alternatives.

So, what is the process that we went through? Initially when we determined that an on time critical removal action is required, we develop what is called an engineering evaluation cost analysis approval memorandum. This is the very first step in the process where we document that a site is eligible for a removal action, that a cleanup is needed. And we would then begin to -- once we have the approval memorandum in place, we also establish a public record. We have

PROCEEDING

a repository setup. I'll go into that in future slides. And then we draft the engineering evaluation cost analysis. Once that engineering evaluation is complete, we then have a public comment period where we open up a public comment period and invite the public to come and review the document and then provide us with their comments or questions. And that's where we are at right now. Once the public comment period closes on April 17th, we would then draft an action memorandum. And in this action memorandum would be what we call a responsiveness summary. This is where we take all the comments and the questions that we received. We would then summarize them as responsiveness summary and attach it to the action memorandum along with EPAs' answers. Once that action memorandum is in place, we would

then take steps to start a cleanup of the property.

In the engineering evaluation, we have three different parts. We have an area the executive summary where we summarize our removal action objectives. These are our cleanup objectives that we put in place when we issue a cleanup at the site. We then develop our removal action alternative or cleanup options and we would do a comparative analysis for those cleanup options and evaluate those cleanup options. Then after we do our comparative analysis and evaluation, we would then have what is a preferred removal action alternative. So EPA would recommend what our preferred removal action is for this property.

So the EECA that was completed for the Jewett White Lead Site was completed for a portion of the

PROCEEDING

Jewett White Lead Site. So it was only done for the 2000, 2012 Richmond Terrace property, the vacant parcel of land that sits on the corner of Park Avenue and Richmond Terrace.

Additional investigations are needed at the 2015 Richmond Terrace property. When we had gone out to do our soil sampling, we did collect some samples beneath the pavement. We did find high led levels beneath the pavement at that property. But we were unable to determine or unable to fully characterize all of the led impacts at that site. So we still need to complete that before we move forward with the next steps. And a separate engineering evaluation may be developed for that property. And our future sampling events will take place this year at 2015 Richmond Terrace property.

So during our investigation,

PROCEEDING

we would map out both properties that makeup the site, the Jewett White Lead Site during the month of October, and we collected soil samples from the surface all the way down to either the water table or until we reached the extent of the led contamination which is when we found led below 800 parts per million. And I know in the past in other meetings that we had we discussed a couple of different numbers for led. 400 parts per million would be the one that we discussed when we were doing the offsite sampling in the community. That is a soil screening level that we use for residential properties. Since this is an industrial commercial property, our cleanup goal for this site would be 800 parts per million. When we did our investigation, we also installed monitoring on both properties to

PROCEEDING

determine whether or not we had any ground water that was impacted by the very high concentrations of lead that we had at both properties. So the average led concentration that we have across the 2000, 2012 Richmond Terrace property is up here (indicating). The one listed at the five-foot depth. These numbers are a little bit misleading and I'll show you in the next slide why. The led contamination that we found was confined mostly to the upper three and a half feet of soil on the 2000, 2012 Richmond Terrace property. The exception of a small area, very well defined area of the southwest corner of the property. What we found is the led concentration dropped off significantly below 100 parts per million beneath the four-foot depth. We did not see any ground water impact on this property in the monitoring levels that we took.

PROCEEDING

So, this here is a sampling map at a four-foot depth of 2000 Richmond Terrace property. The green dots represent soil sampling, locations and led concentrations that are below 800 parts per million. The red dots actually represent led impacts greater than 800 parts per million. This is the southwest corner I was talking about (indicating). And the concentrations of led go as high as 74,000. I know it's a bit hard to see. But 74,000 parts per million to about 42,000 parts per million which divides up that average across the entire site when you average them all in together.

At the five-foot depth this is the area that is impacted. Beneath this is a six-foot depth. We then would have green across the entire site. We would have led concentrations beneath that

PROCEEDING

800 parts per million.

So during the development of EECA, our removal action objectives were developed. And this is to prevent or minimize the migration as to how the substances are released at the site. Basically what that means is that we would either minimize or reduce or stop the movement of the led contaminated soils off the property either into the ground water and the surrounding community, the sediment or the surface water around the Kull Van Kull.

Our next removal action objective is to abate, minimize, stabilize, mitigate or remove the containments such that any unacceptable risks are eliminated. Basically what that means is the high concentration if it poses an unacceptable risk to human or ecological populations that use that

site that those risks would be removed or reduced. And then our third removal action objective is to restore the property to its current use.

During the engineering evaluation we also developed a streamlined human health risk evaluation and ecological risk evaluation. And what this basically says is that both for humans or the current receptor, which would be the industrial or commercial worker, that led levels present in the surface and the subsurface soils poses an unacceptable risk. And the same with the ecological evaluation it posses an unacceptable risk to any kind of ecological populations that may be using this site.

So, the removal action alternatives, the cleanup options that we evaluated -- we have five of them. We then evaluated with the

comparative analysis against these criteria. Effectiveness: Can all our removal options meet the objectives? Is it protective of human health in the environment? Is it protective in the long term or is it protective in the short term? Implementability, is it feasible? Can we do it? Is it proven technology? Is the equipment that we are going to use readily available. And then cost. This is the estimated construction and operation maintenance cost for each removal action for up to 30 years if long term monitoring or maintenance is required. So the alternatives that we looked at, the cleanup options, alternative one, this is a no action alternative. This is a baseline for comparison for the other four alternatives. And basically this is where we would take no action. So no active

measures would be put in place to cleanup the property. The property would be left as is. The only thing we would do is to implement a public awareness program to make the public and the community aware that there are unacceptable or high led concentrations in the soil that may pose a risk to the public. And the cost for this removal action alternative is $10,050.

Alternative two: This is the excavation and offsite treatment and disposal of the led contaminated soils. Under this alternative we would excavate the soil with the higher led concentrations above the 800 parts per million. This would be approximately 4,200 cubic yards of soil. This would not require any long term monitoring or maintenance and no administrative control. What that means is we wouldn't have to put any controls in place such as

PROCEEDING

soil management plan or restrictions or any other kind of controls to make sure that this alternative is effective in the long term or is being maintained. This cleanup option will eliminate the potential for the movement of those led contaminated soils into the community, and it would eliminate the risk of contact with those high concentrations of led. The cost is $924,153. And these costs are based on estimates. So, I know there are exact figures, but it's an estimated cost.

Alternative three: The soil cap or what we call an earthing cap. This is where we would excavate the top two feet of the contaminated soils and we would place clean fill or clean soil over top of the higher led concentrations at depth. This would be excavating approximately 2,400 cubic yards of soil and then

PROCEEDING

backfilling with clean soil. We would have to do some long term monitoring and operation maintenance. We would have to monitor the ground water to make sure that the higher concentrations of led are not impacting the ground water. We would have to have some sort of controls in place to make sure that this earthing cap is being maintained by the current property owner. The risk of contact with the led contamination at depth is greatly reduced by covering it with clean soil. The cost is $644,076.

The fourth alternative we looked at is paving. This would be where we would remove the top six inches of soil to maintain the existing grade. We would then bring in asphalt and put down an asphalt cover over the led contaminated soils. So it's basically like paving a parking lot. And in the

PROCEEDING

long term we would be required to do some long term monitoring and some maintenance. So we would have to monitor the ground water to make sure that the led concentrations that remain at depth are not impacted in the ground water and we would have to have some controls in place to make sure this asphalt cap is being maintained. The risk of contact is reduced by capping that contaminated soil. The cost is $354,711.

And the final alternative that we looked at is alternative five. Immobilization. This is where we would take a concrete additive and mix it in with the top two feet of soil to basically harden and bind the led so it would not be readily available or available by contact. It would not leach into the ground water and it would prevent deeper soils from being impacted by the

PROCEEDING

soils at the top that are mixed with this concrete additive. Since we are leaving high led levels in place at depth, we would have to do some long term monitoring and we would have some sort of controls in place to make sure that this cap is being maintained in the long term. So it's protective of the human health and the environment. And the risk of contact with that soil is greatly reduced by using this alternative. And the cost would be $279,315.

So EPA then has chosen a preferred removal action alternative. Our preferred cleanup option for this property is alternative two. The excavation and offsite treatment of the led contaminated soils that exceed or greater than 800 parts per million of led.

When we did our comparative analysis and looked at it, we found

PROCEEDING

that under effectiveness, the potential for the future movement of those led contaminated soils from the site we eliminated and we would remove the potential that people would come in contact with the elevated levels of led present in the deeper soils. If you remember some of the soils at depth, I think it was a two-foot depth go as high as 100,000 parts per million.

Implementability. This is an easy alternative to implement and that it uses a proven earth moving equipment and techniques and backhoes or excavators will be readily available and no controls would have to be put in place once the removal action is initiated. And as for cost, while this alternative has a higher cost than the other alternatives, it is a permanent action. It requires no long term oversight monitoring

maintenance to make sure that it's effective or protective. And EPA feels that this added cost is worth it for the extra benefit that we receive for the protectiveness of human health in the environment.

So now that this engineering evaluation is complete, what are our next steps? Our public comment period. Where we are at right now. That's why we are here today. Our public comment period opened on March 4th and it will extend to April 17, 2011. This engineering evaluation is open for the public to review it, to evaluate it and to submit their comments or questions to the EPA. We rely upon your input to make sure that we are hearing the concerns of communities when we select the effective removal option or the cleanup option for this property. When we receive these public comments, we are required to

PROCEEDING

provide a written response to significant comments which would be included in the action memorandums as an attachment.

These comments could be submitted to myself by e-mail, through postal letter or today at the public meeting. We have proposed response action documents on each of the tables. If you don't want to write this down now, my information, and where you can submit your comments if you don't want to speak to me tonight, are right there on the back of the document.

So EPA has provided a preferred response action which is alternative two, the excavation and disposal of the led contaminated soils above 800 parts per million. While this is our preferred response action, this does not always mean this will be the final cleanup

PROCEEDING

action at this site. Since the document is open for the public to review and to comment, and we will be taking into consideration those comments when we select our action, it may change what the removal action will be at the property.

So where is this EECA and how could I review it? We have put the engineering evaluation on the internet at our EPA website. So you could review the document in its entirety. It's about 456 pages and most of that is charts, logs and samplings maps.

You can also review a paper copy at the Port Richmond Branch of the New York Public Library. We have set up a repository there, it's part of the administrative record and the document is there for you to review. And we also have in the Superfund record center in our Edison Office of the EPA.

PROCEEDING

So how will the community know which removal action we actually select for this property? We will write an action memorandum which is a written document of our decision for what the cleanup action is going to be at this property. And again this will include responses to significant comments that we receive during this public comment period. And this will be a part of the public record which will be included in the public library at the Port Richmond Branch, and it will also be available on the internet, the action memo with the response summary attached. And again I'm going to leave this up here for anybody that doesn't want to speak up tonight. Here is where you could submit your comments either by e-mail or by postal mail. We encourage you to submit your comments. That's why we're here

PROCEEDING

today. Thank you.

MR. WILSON: Thank you, Kim. Before we go to public comments, we want to give Ian Beilby from the New York State Department of Environmental Conversation an opportunity to comment on our EECA and our actions.

MR. BEILBY: Thank you, sir. As Eric has said a little bit earlier I'm from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. I'm an environmental engineer. And the DEC has been involved with the site since June 2008 as well. With the understanding that EPA has served as the lead agency on the site, we basically been functioning in an advisory capacity regarding state standards and guidance and kind of treating it as if the state were doing the cleanup and looking out for some of those regulations that

PROCEEDING

we have.

To give you a little more detail, we've provided input on the plans to do the various investigations that EPA has conducted at the site and around the site. We reviewed the environmental data that has been generated from those investigations. And we have participated in the development of various alternatives that Kim went through in her presentation. And through our involvement and all that participation, the State also believes that the alternative number two, the alternative that would remove approximately 4,000 cubic yards of contaminated soil from the property is the best alternative and the New York City DEC supports that approach. And it's not out of line with what we would do if the state were conducting this project.

Thanks for giving me the

PROCEEDING

opportunity. I will be sticking around if anyone wants to come and talk to me later. Thanks.

MS. AYALA: Thank you.

We're going to open up the floor. Like I said earlier, when speaking just say your name so that the stenographer could have it on record, please.

MR. KITTS: Charles Kitts. Head of the Port Richmond Improvement Association. There are bus stops there. And in this community, I think a lot more people rely on public transportation than other communities. You have people there. You have children waiting there. Children waiting to board, they are playing with the dirt. What could be done right now to do something about that? Move the bus stops? Is that possible? And then the other question I have is, people usually ask me when will this be

PROCEEDING

taken care of? Is there a timeline? I saw a little timeline there. When could we expect hopefully alternative two to happen? When will that actually take place?

MR. WILSON: Again, Eric Wilson, with EPA. Thank you for the questions.

Regarding the bus stops and the current status of the site, when we first became aware that contaminates from the 2000 Richmond Terrace property could migrate off site, we oversaw an action taken by the property owner to stabilize that site.

So you see that the site is fenced. The soil is vegetated. There are wind screens up. There are warning signs. So, the site currently is stable. Our plan is now to cleanup that site.

So for your second question, we are going to take our public

PROCEEDING

comments. We'll select the response action. And then we would expect to start the cleanup later this year. Thank you.

MR. DMYTRYSZYN: Nick Dmytryszyn environmental engineering to the borough president.

First of all, on my boss' behalf we are glad alternative two is being looked at as a serious option. I think that for the community in general to remove a source completely and to be able to bring it to a level of non-led contaminated industrial site is in the best interest of everybody.

We welcome that. When you do finally do that memorandum that anything related to the work plan, what the community may see in terms of truck traffic, et cetera, that there be lines of communication open. So that there aren't any surprises or the fact that perhaps

PROCEEDING

the agencies we have to deal with may not be as familiar with some of the problems that the community does mention quite frequently to the City DOT, City DEP, State DOT on the traffic, et cetera. But, I think that for all tense and purposes to have that amount of led there at that site, turn it into either a paved parking lot, to leave any material there, people need to understand in essence if you leave the material there, you could never build on it. You would always have to be concerned that there will be depredation. It just will delay having to deal with the issue truly as a method of how to get it out of here. So that at least I'm pleased, I'm grateful that that is the option that hopefully will become finalized.

Leading up to it and what you're going to do starting with it,

PROCEEDING

we would encourage a level of communications and activity from us to you so that we could get this done as quickly as possible and as smoothly as possible. And that any impacts to any constituents and residents would be minimized to the greatest. So for that we thank you and we hope that things go as smoothly as your presentation.

MS. AYALA: Thank you, Nick.

Anyone else?

MS. SHERRY: Virginia Sherry from Staten Island Advance.

One quick question I will turn to: What precautions are taken to ensure that when the excavation is being done that led or led particles aren't reached into the surrounding area?

MS. STAIGER: If alternative two is the cleanup option that is selected as the final cleanup option for this property, we would wet the

PROCEEDING

soils to make sure the soils are damped so that there will not be any led dust generated. We would also take the same measures that we had taken in our past investigation when we were doing our test pit soil sampling where we had air monitoring equipment setup on the site. It would blink. Like if we generated dust, it would blink to let us know that there was some dust being generated. We were also sampling on the perimeter, the perimeter air monitoring sampling going on to make sure that none of that led contamination was actually moving into the community. The personnel that were working on the site or will be working on the site will also be wearing personal air monitoring pumps to make sure that they are not being exposed to any led contamination either.

MS. AYALA: Anybody else?

PROCEEDING

MR. DMYTRYSZYN: If I could just add to what Kim was saying, if anyone wants to see levels of construction activities related to contamination, just go down to the Brookfield Landfill Remediation in which they are not excavating, but they have to remove soil around. There are air monitoring stations around. There are truck washing stations, there are dampening, there are misters. Trucks could walk up and go around into the areas so that in essence what is on the site stays on the site. Does not come through. There are enough constituents and residents on the island that complain about the dust being generated by the truck traffic. There is always a concern what is on site should stay on site and not go offsite.

So what Kim just explained is happening right now on the south

PROCEEDING

shore. And I'll say quiet frankly I think there has been one complaint in 14 months about dust being generated from that site. So we're pleased that something as basic as just wetting down the material, taking care of it. Obviously if there are heavy rains, et cetera they have their own action plans. But it's not a high level of sophistication for trying to minimize soil excavation and removal even if its contaminated.

MS. BIELSA: Kathleen Bielsa from North Field LDC. I just have a question. The water side, the lot that is on the water side is paved right now. You said there would be additional testing.

Is that part of this preferred treatment plan any way or they're going to be handled separately? You don't have a preferred treatment plan for that?

PROCEEDING

MS. STAIGER: No. This engineering evaluation was only done for a portion of Jewett White Lead Site. So it was only done for that triangular piece of property. That one acre site, that 2000 Richmond Terrace. We did find elevated led concentrations in the soil at the 2015 Richmond Terrace property. What we don't know is that does it extend to the neighboring properties? Does it go into the Kill Van Kull? Is it present in the sediments.

So we need to determine or fully delineate or characterize the led impact before we could develop any kind of cleanup options.

MS. BIELSA: That was my next question.

Whether it was in the water or not? There are no ongoing documentation needed or controls needed into the future once you do

PROCEEDING

something. I'm happy that you are taking the most aggressive treatment it seems like as the preferred treatment plan. But because it's an industrial site, the standard can be a little higher, the 800 parts per million versus 400 parts per million residential. What if a generation or two from now they decided to change the zoning. Would there be any kind of a flag on that property if the zoning does change?

MR. WILSON: There will always be the records that EPA took an action at the site and cleaned up the 800. If a change in property use is proposed, then it would be incumbent on the property owner who is making that change to do whatever additional measures is necessary.

MS. STAIGER: Just to add on that, when we do our excavation, if alternative two is the selected clean up action for this property,

when we do that excavation and backfilling, before we backfill our excavation, we would be taking confirmatory samples from the bottom, from the base of those pits to determine what led concentrations are that we are leaving in place. So we would know whether or not we had anything above 800 or anything above 400 which is the residential screening level that we look at, but below our 800 number for this site.

MR. WILSON: That's another good point. After we dig out 4,000 cubic yards or so, if that option is selected, we would also be backfilling the clean fill. So not only have we dug it out, there is clean fill, four-foot of clean fill in there that people are building on top of it. The 800 parts of million led is at depth. It's not on the surface where anybody would come into contact with. So there is very

PROCEEDING

little likelihood that even with a change in use, there is exposure to that.

MS. THURMAN: Beryl Thurman. I'm with the North Shore Waterfront Conservancy of Staten Island, and we are in favor of alternative two. Because we strongly believe that we cannot leave it to other people in the future to remember what has taken place here. And to be as cautious in the safety of the community. Things are easily forgotten.

So we believe very strongly that alternative two is the best route to go. So that we don't have to worry about anyone be it government or the community doing future supervising or monitoring of this property. I mean it's too easily forgotten what happens in places. And 30 years can pass very quickly, and all of us that are

sitting in this room will either be gone or someplace else. So from this point on, anyone else who is talking alternative two is what we want. Alternative two is what we need and nothing else is acceptable. Thank you.

MS. JOHNSON: Christine Johnson. Representing council woman Debbie Rose and also I'm here with our two staff members.

Ms. Rose can't be here tonight. But she clearly wants the staff to be here to listen to the community and fully understand and appreciate the feelings of the community in a matter as sensitive as this. And council woman Rose wants everyone to know that she is supporting alternative two. And the cost effectiveness is clearly without question, seems to be the only solution that takes care of this particular site at the present

PROCEEDING

time and all future times without any continued risk from the site of the community ongoing in the future periods of time. So very supportive of alternative two. Very welcome to listen to the comments from the community. And will be actively listening and watching as they move forward on this project.

MS. AYALA: Thank you. Anyone else?

MERCADO: Donvalo Mercado. I thank you for the presentation. Thank you for offering that alternative two which I am also in favor of.

My question as I made it earlier is in terms of the cleaning process and in all of the other people that should be involved while that is going on. Like for example, public transportation, rerouting bus lines and also the bus stops are right next to the areas. To

PROCEEDING

official representatives today, I think it would be really important that you guys could help us to make sure that all of these other people that are going to be working with you when this cleanup process happens are also at the table so we could get help to the people who are walking around either are transported. Also not going to be transported to other places where people are walking in the area waiting for the bus right next to the cleaning site. Those are the basic concerns. I want to make sure our address in that process is in place.

MS. AYALA: Thank you.

MS. STAIGER: Once we have a final cleanup action selected, we will be opening up communications with the Department of Transportation for truck traffic or whatever is required. We will also

be opening up communications with the MTA if needed, if we have to address the bus stops that are present along Richmond Terrace or along Park Avenue for the cleanup option that is selected.

MR. DOLSON: Ashly Dolson. I wonder where the soil would be taken and how it would be treated if you do select option two?

MR. WILSON: We haven't selected the location yet. It would go to a regulated landfill where it would be treated in accordance with regulation. If there's led that could leach out of it, it would be treated first and then landfills which is, you know, in a secured location. But we have not yet selected a location for that as we have not selected what action we will take.

MR. DOLSON: Presumably that will be included in the final

PROCEEDING

memorandum?

MR. WILSON: That wouldn't be included when we select a cleanup action. We would do that after we select the cleanup action when we develop work plans for how the work would be accomplished.

MS. KIM: Aileen Kim, representing Reverend Terry Troia from Project Hospitality. I would just like to echo everyone else's support for alternative two. It seems as if it is the most comprehensive. And as an organization that serves many of the disenfranchise population on Staten Island, I think it is very important to take this aggressive remedial approach as well.

MS. AYALA: You guys could ask questions too. You're free.

MR. HERNANDEZ: David Hernandez from City Council for Debbie Rose office.

PROCEEDING

Could you elaborate on how the site is stable now and that process and the levels that are being kept constant. Exactly what is the stabilization?

MS. STAIGER: Okay. What had happened in April 2009, we had gone to the current property owner, the Feder (phonetic) Realty company, we shared with him our sampling results showing that there were elevated concentrations of led surface soils and depth. What we had was surface soils 5,042 million which is much higher than its 800 parts per million that we're using as our example right not. So when we had gone forward to him, we asked him to implement this. In our removal action, it was planting grass seed on site. If you plant grass on the site it will hold the soils in place. On site when the wind blows through it wouldn't pickup any dust

PROCEEDING

that could then blow into neighboring properties. If you are familiar with the property, there's a train trestle there. Right behind the property on the other side of that elevated train line are property owners. There is a neighborhood directly behind that site. So we were very much concerned about those led contaminated soils blowing onto their property. So that soil, that grass seed actually holds that soil in place. And I've tried to come by once or twice a month or if someone calls me and makes sure the grass is growing to make sure that the silk fence is in place around the site. If you go to the property from the sidewalk and you'll see beneath the wind screen -- the wind screen is the green screen around the entire fence. The silk screen is actually a black silk screen that is probably

PROCEEDING

about maybe half high. And what that prevents is any soils that are on site that aren't being held down by grass. It prevents them from coming off the site into the storm water run off. So it wouldn't be on the sidewalks. And during our previous sampling that's when we were actually doing improving or digging or sampling, we had these air monitoring stations setup and we didn't detect any led concentrations above -- it's called NAAQS National Ambient Air Quality Standards. So we didn't see any led contamination coming from the site or any wind blown dust containing led concentrations that we were concerned that would be above that NAAQ Standard.

MR. HERNANDEZ: How often do you monitor?

MS. STAIGER: Well, if we received complaints from the

community saying, you know, we're standing here on Richmond Terrace and that wind screen is just flapping in the wind, we would then come out and take a look and confirm that it's blowing in the breeze. It's not being maintained. And contact the property owner to maintain the property.

My visits have maybe been several times. I have to go back to like my site log to look, but maybe as frequent as once a month. Sometimes once every two or three months to come out to make sure that the site is being stabilized.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Is it the property owner's responsibility to maintain the stabilization?

MS. STAIGER: Yes.

MS. THURMAN: Beryl Thurman. In terms of the residents that are near that property, Park Avenue and whose properties abut up against it

PROCEEDING

or on the Heberton side of it, will those property owners be able to garden safely with their current soil conditions or no?

MR. MADDALOVI: Mark Maddalovi. I have been out with this community. We actually talked about gardening.

Now the offsite sampling, nowhere in the north shore is it pristine. And generally led levels run from 200 to 300 in Veterans Park up to 500 to 600 everywhere else.

Now, I think and I certainly communicated at previous meetings that gardening first is a good thing. That we don't want to discourage it without sound reason. Right now you are growing the food. There's esthetic benefits of gardening. You're saving some money. So we are pro-gardening. We want people to do it safely. And as the led levels rise, I think you

PROCEEDING

have to start to take some precautions. So, I don't know what the specific levels are in those properties. We could go back. And if they have them, then it would be a little bit more informed, but generally in the 500 to 1,000 range, which is quite common for many of the properties in this area, I would begin to start taking some precautions. Adding amending agents like phosphate. A lot of fertilizer. You also want to be thoughtful about the types of vegetables you're growing. We know that fruity vegetables take up very little led. So grow your tomatoes, grow your peppers, grow your eggplants. Stay away from root vegetables like potatoes and carrots and leafy green vegetables, because they take up a lot of led, and just frankly it's hard to get the dirt off of them very effectively.

PROCEEDING

So you could do that. The next step, and I know it's expensive, to have raised gardens. We have been talking with the Cornell Healthy Homes Extension possibly about trying to work with this community to provide, you know, clean soils for garden purposes. I make no promises, but that's just one of the avenues we're pursuing. That would be the ultimate thing. Certainly if you have real high levels like consistently over 1,000, I would strongly recommend raised beds. But in the 500 or so range, I think you just need to be careful when you are gardening so you're not tracking stuff in. That's a standard good housekeeping practice. That should be practiced under any event when you're gardening. And again I would just add that you add fertilizer to your soil. And I would shy away from root vegetables

PROCEEDING

or leafy green vegetables and go with more fruity vegetables. I think gardening can occur in this community. I don't want to discourage something that is clearly beneficial to public health.

MS. DELVARON: Lena Delvaron North Shore Waterfront Conservancy. Will there be educational brochures or handouts to communities expressing exactly what's going on with the project? What type of cleanup is going on at this site as well as the tips that you just mentioned about gardening?

MS. AYALA: I could answer that.

At previous meetings we gave handouts of gardening, because it was an issue, because we came like early last Summer or late Spring almost Summer and we provided some handouts. And, Kim and I have tried, as much as possible, to be in

PROCEEDING

the community and to give you the information as soon as it becomes public. We're around at any given day. So it's not like something comes out and we wait and then it comes to the community. We're right here. So any time anything that is happening, we come out. We go door to door. We stop at businesses. We visit with Beryl. We visit the reverend. And we also have a contact information. At any time you have any concerns or any questions, feel free to call me. Call Kim. We're available.

MS. DELVARON: I guess what I'm looking for is with the season changing, it would probably be nice to have something go out again, and discussing where we are at until the thing is resolved.

MS. JOHNSON: Is there literature that you have setup with the library like a little area where

PROCEEDING

people could just take it out and take it home?

MS. AYALA: We tried, but they're not receptive to it all the time. It depends on who is working. Some people are glad to have the information. Other people, you know, because --

MR. DMYTRYSZYN: The public library is unfortunately an independent system. They have their own nuisances. Their own personalities. What I would probably suggest is -- I don't know whether or not if any of the stores on Port Richmond Avenue -- maybe something with the LPC, something in the Advance perhaps could be put through, but in terms of like you can't force the library to accept the brochure. We had that issue just at the St. George library that many times has become controversial. It's always been an issue. We

PROCEEDING

always try to think for those that don't normally buy the newspaper or have the computer or an internet, how do you get information across? Do they go to their churches? Do they go to their religious organizations? Do they go to a CYO?

MS. AYALA: We're willing to work with any organization that will give us a little space or has a table and provide whatever information the community is interested at the time.

MR. DMYTRYSZYN: May I suggest that if the community knows of any events, block parties or if the religious institutions don't have a problem with putting it in their vestibule to have a table, take advantage of Wanda or Kim to say hey, we need 40 brochures on gardening and 40 of these actions going on there. Those institutions don't have them. But let me tell

PROCEEDING

you for all the years I have been on the island, one of the hardest things is how do you get information out to the community. The cost of mailing has now become prohibited. What do you do? How do you reach out? It's always a problem. But we are always open to any suggestion. Unfortunately the library -- you can'6 even give it out at the school. I will tell you right now it depends on the principal. We try to do something in Brookfield and I'll tell you that I was horrified that one principal absolutely refused to give anything to the students at the PTA. And that's strictly coming out from the Department of Education kind of directive.

So every area is different. You may have great teachers. I always tell the EPA do it through the kids. The kids are always the

PROCEEDING

best thing, Mommy, Daddy look here at this or whoever it is at home saying this is what I got. This could be a good way, but we kind of run out of ideas. We truly have.

MS. STAIGER: Just to add to that. We also have the fact sheets that we generated in the past. They should be available on that EPA website which is up here. And if they're not, I'll make sure that they are put up on that website so that they are available to anybody who has internet access. When we put that action memorandum with the responses of the summary attached to it into the administrative record, I will make sure that we also include any past and current fact sheets that we pass out within the community in the public record. And that administrative record is in the New York Public Library. It's in a binder. They had it in the back

PROCEEDING

where they have other public records on other actions that are taking place on the island. And it's right on the corner of Heberton and Bennett.

MR. MADDALOVI: My colleague Julie mentioned another helpful gardening tip. So as long as we have an audience here I think we will communicate it. And that is you shouldn't be gardening along the drip line of your home. That's where the gutters run along the perimeter or the footprint of a house. And that's for two reasons, because when it rains, whatever led is in the air gets picked up and deposited on the roofs and then it runs down. And we have always found whatever levels we find on a property, among the highest are always around the drip line against it, it's from what drips from the rain and also especially in this

PROCEEDING

community there's a lot of older homes which have exterior led base paint and that would also contribute to higher levels around the foundation of the house. So if you're planting your garden, try to move it away from the foundation of the home. That's a really good tip.

MR. MAHLER: Christopher Mahler. I'm not only an owner of the property here in Port Richmond area, I'm also a real estate agent for Safari Realty. I'm doing a canvassing campaign. So if you have information that you want, we're actually going door to door knocking on doors to give out business information such things as from North Field LDC and now their upcoming home buying memorandums and meetings, things like that. So if you need something delivered in a four block or eight block radius around the site, please give copies

PROCEEDING

to me. I'm going to be doing that starting March 21st next week Monday. If anybody else has anything that they want to go into the bag on information about your organizations, whatever, please see me after the meeting.

MS. AYALA: Thank you.

Anything else? Comments?

MS. THURMAN: Is anyone opposed to this in any way? Don't be shy.

MR. MAHLER: One quick question about the cost for the different methods that you are doing, where is the money coming from to pay for it?

MR. MADDALOVI: Comes from you and me.

MR. WILSON: The work that we have done, the investigations, the engineering evaluations cost analysis, federal government has paid that money.

PROCEEDING

When it comes to selecting, after we select a response action, the cleanup action to be taken, we will invite responsible parties. Those parties responsible for the contamination to conduct that work. If they are unwilling, unable to do that work, then EPA will take on that work with federal funds and we will see to recover those costs from the responsible parties.

MS. DELVARON: Lena Delvaron from North Shore Waterfront Conservancy.

Is there grant money available to help the state. So the owner of the property that is contaminated, will there be grant money made available to help them do the work?

MR. WILSON: You're talking about the property owner at 2000 Richmond Terrace or are you talking about --

MS. DELVARON: In general. As

PROCEEDING

part of this process.

MR. WILSON: No. There is no grant money available to other folks to do this work or to do cleanup.

MS. AYALA: Yes.

MS. DAVIS: Debra Davis. Concerned citizen. I came to a meeting that you gave that was at the school. I think it was --

MS. AYALA: Port Richmond High or P.S. 20?

MS. DAVIS: P.S. 20. And you passed out some -- I think it was a Power Point Presentation which you recorded the different led levels in two different sites. And from what I could understand, Moran Towing site had vastly higher led levels than the Seduto's site. And I'm just wondering what is the procedure for -- it sounds like that's been put on the back burner.

MS. STAIGER: Well, when we had come out to P.S. 20 and we did

PROCEEDING

our presentation on the offsite sampling, we also included the sampling that we had done on the Moran Towing property 2015 Richmond Terrace. The led levels we had at the surface soils which was like -- we collected it from areas of the asphalt paving that were deteriorated where you see significant potholes or whether it was sample soil and from that one unpaved area of the property. And we also collected it -- if you look at the property, there's a strip between the sidewalk and property itself where there's some vegetation growing. Where it looked like there was some soil that we could collect. The average across the surface of just that is zero to three inches across that site is actually a thousand parts per million. What we had seen at 2000 Richmond Terrace the former Seduto's property, was

PROCEEDING

5,000 parts. So it was actually five times higher at the 2000 Richmond Terrace. At the 2015 Richmond Terrace when we went back out in October of this year, we found elevated levels of led comparable at depth to what we had found at the 2000 Richmond Terrace property. So we are not leaving it on the back burner. We will be coming back out to sample. We will be sampling this year to determine whether or not what kind of cleanup would be needed for that property.

MS. THURMAN: And you'll keep us informed?

MS. STAIGER: Yes. We will be doing an action memo. When we do the action memo, we will do something similar to what we've done in the past with the fax sheets where we go out to the community and provide facts sheets of what cleanup is selected. We will provide facts

PROCEEDING

sheets on what actions or what led levels people may be exposed to from other properties, yes.

MS. SLEDGE: Michelle Sledge North Field Community LDC.

Just a question. As you publish your materials and your documents and your fax sheets, are they published bilingually like in Spanish as well as English.

MS. AYALA: Yes. Absolutely.

MS. SLEDGE: Everything?

MS. AYALA: Yes.

MR. GRILLO: Steve Grillo from the Staten Island Economic Development Corporation.

The question is for funding issues and then the involvement. Especially with the state DC's involvement.

Where does the City's OER agency come into plans? Have you discussed anything with the office of environmental mediation regarding

PROCEEDING

their ground fill cleanup programs? There is funding available through that agency. I know they're trying to foster their relationship at the state level of the DEC. And they do have active projects in remediation or discuss remediation on Richmond Terrace. Have you engaged them at all? And if not, I'll be more than happy to facilitate a meeting between the two agencies if necessary?

MR. WILSON: I'm sorry. Is that question directed to EPA or --

MR. GRILLO: Both parties. Obviously I don't know if you're familiar with the New York City OER, Office of Environmental Remediation. So they run a large ground field remediation program with the City. They also have facilitated relationships with the state when it comes to cleanups and letters of approval, etc.

PROCEEDING

Have they been brought in at all to discuss the property? And if not, have there been any discussions about grants through that agency? If you say no, that's fine. Just curious if you had any relation with that agency.

MR. WILSON: We have been coordinating activities with the City of New York. And, you know this is a federal lead site and the City recognizes that. So we're taking the lead with the actions here and we're keeping New York City informed of what we are doing.

MS. SLEDGE: Michele Sledge. North Field Community LDC.

As most parties are aware, Port Richmond is a ground field opportunity area, and so this is an active funding process, an active engaged process through which ground field opportunity where opportunity is available. So it has multiple

PROCEEDING

sites of study. We would look to actively engage this site as well within the existing site. Port Richmond is a ground opportunity. I'm saying this is one site. This is one site among many in the area that is actively already being studied for purposes of ground field opportunity. So therefore, I'm saying that there is an opportunity to further develop and further explore this within the context of either state funding or City office of environmental remediation. There's already a project on that within Port Richmond and Manors Harbor.

Is that confusing?

MS. THURMAN: They're going to clean it up. This is a super fund cleaning.

MS. SLEDGE: The city sees that. I'm saying for everything further along for other sites

PROCEEDING

hopefully become clean. Then there may be opportunities to do other things.

MS. THURMAN: You mean other opportunities to develop.

MS. SLEDGE: To develop.

MS. THURMAN: Okay. I just want to get passed the two-year part.

MS. SLEDGE: Exactly. I understand. At the federal level with this being designated, there's a lot of work to be done there. We didn't even get to discuss the site as potential ground field.

MR. WILSON: And the site is a privately owned site.

MS. THURMAN: Absolutely.

MR. WILSON: Use of the site is up to the property owner.

MS. AYALA: Anymore questions? We want to thank you for being here tonight. Please feel free. We have some business cards. If you want to

PROCEEDING

talk to us about the site, we're going to stick around for a little while. Thank you so much for coming.

(Time noted: 8:21 p.m.)

STATE OF NEW YORK)
) ss.:
COUNTY OF NEW YORK)

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, CHRISTINE CUTRONE, Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public within and for the State of New York, do hereby state:

That the foregoing record of proceedings is a full and correct transcript of the stenographic notes taken by me therein.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 21st day of March, 2011.

CHRISTINE CUTRONE

ORIGINAL

Fink & Carney
Reporting and Video

39 West 37th Street, Sixth Floor
New York, New York 10018
212-869-1500
1-800-NYC-FINK - 1-877-FAX-FINK
www.finkandcarney.com